



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,749	01/02/2004	Hsu-Pin Kao	250323-1041	1854
24504	7590	03/23/2005	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			KEANEY, ELIZABETH MARIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,749

Applicant(s)

KAO ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth Keaney

Art Unit

2882

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/5/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1,6,7 and 12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,791,265.

Claims 1,6,7 and 12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,791,265 in view of Yura et al. (US Patent 6,522,072; hereinafter Yura).

US Patent 6,791,265 shows all the limitations of claims 1,6,7 and 12 except for the driving electrode being located in a portion of the luminant cells, which is harder to be driven than the rest of the luminant cells, in each pixel.

Art Unit: 2882

Yura discloses driving electrodes being located in a portion of the luminant cells, which is harder to be driven than the rest of the luminant cells, in each pixel (column 25, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include driving electrodes located in a portion of the luminant cells, which is harder to be driven than the rest of the luminant cells, in each pixel within the plasma display panel of US Patent 6,791,265 because it allows for greater control of the desired white color temperature during discharge (Yura; column 26, lines 5-10).

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 1, line 7: "rest luminant"; should be --rest of the luminant--.
- Claim 7, lines 5 and 9: "rest luminant"; should be --rest of the luminant--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "said luminant units" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yura.

Re claims 1 and 7: Yura discloses in figure 18 and throughout the disclosure, a driving electrode structure for a plasma display panel formed on a transparent electrode across a plurality of pixels in a row, wherein each pixel is composed of at least three luminant cells, the driving electrode structure comprising:

- a driving electrode (16) located in a portion of the luminant cells, which is harder to be driven than the rest of the luminant cells, in each pixel and separated by a distance from one side of the transparent electrode (55) adjacent to an edge of the luminant cells, the driving electrode having two branches coupled to two ends of the driving electrode (161) and extending to the side of the transparent electrode; and
- a side electrode (162) located between the branches in the rest of the luminant cells of each pixel and on the side of the transparent electrode

adjacent to the edge of luminant cells, the side electrode connecting the branches,

- whereby a white color at a desired color temperature can be obtained for each of the pixels (column 26, lines 8-11).

Re claims 2 and 8: Yura discloses the material of the driving electrode and the side electrode being silver (column 11, line 27).

Re claims 3 and 9: Yura discloses the driving electrode approximating a discharge center of the luminant cells (column 11, lines 20-35).

Re claims 4 and 10: Yura discloses the driving electrode located in the green luminant cell (column 25, line 14).

Re claims 5 and 11: Yura discloses the driving electrode (16) and side electrode (26) positioned on the first substrate (51) and the barrier ribs (74) positioned on the second substrate (71), therefore Yura discloses the two branches of the driving electrode being located above the barrier ribs.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Keaney whose telephone number is (571)272-2489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 5:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on (571)272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMK
emk


EDWARD J. GLICK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER